

Remarks

The claims have been amended by deleting claims 15-17, amending claims 1, 11 and 14. Claims 2 - 10, 12 and 13 are unchanged. Claims 1 to 14 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-3, 7, 9 - 12, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng (6640301 B1).

The invention as claimed in the amended claims is directed towards a method of disseminating information by a first end terminal in a network having a plurality of end terminals operating as distributed servers when performing the disseminating information. In claim 1 it is recited that the end terminals are "operating as distributed servers when performing the disseminating information". This limitation in claim 1 of the end terminals operating as distributed servers provides the benefits of the invention in which information dissemination can be done effectively without the need for a centralized or dedicated server.

In contrast to the invention as now claimed in claim 1, Ng describes information dissemination by an email website server (e.g. a centralized server). Hence, Ng does not describe the use of distributed servers when performing the disseminating information and consequently the benefits of claim 1 cannot be realized by NG. It is therefore submitted that it would not have been obvious, in view of Ng, to deduce the invention as now claimed in claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, 7 and 9 depend from claim 1 and it is therefore submitted that these claims are also being patentable over Ng.

Amended independent claim 10 also has the limitation that the end terminals are "operating as distributed servers when performing the disseminating information". Hence, for the reasons given above it is submitted that claim 10 and dependent claims 11,12 and 14 are patentable over Ng.

The examiners rejection of claim 15 is no longer relevant since this claim has been deleted.

Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng (6640301 B1) in view of Gogerty (US 2004/0117245 A1).

*It is submitted that since claim 4 depends from amended claim 1 and claim 13 depends from amended claim 10 then claims 4 and 13 should be considered allowable.*

*Claims 5, 6, 8, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng (6640301 B1) in view of Sandhu et al (US 2002/0078353 A1).*

It is submitted that since claims 5, 6 and 8 depend from amended claim 1 then these claims should be considered allowable. Also, the examiners rejections of deleted claims 16 and 17 are no longer relevant since these claims have been deleted.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. As the Applicant has overcome all substantive rejections given by the Examiner the Applicant contends that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's rejections to the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter. Finally, please charge any fees (including extension of time fees) or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502117.

Respectfully Submitted,  
MAHAJAN, ET AL.

by: 

Kenneth A. Haas  
Reg. No. 42,614  
Phone: (847) 576-6937  
FAX: (847) 576-3750